The Heikkila Case, P. 4

Was All That Clean Bomb Talk Just A Hoax and A Smoke-Screen for Testing? Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 17 MAY 5, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why the Inspection Debate at the UN is Obsolete

The important point about the flights of the U. S. Strategic Air Command seems to have been missed in the angry debate at the UN and the proposals for Arctic inspection. The important point is what can we do *now* to meet the situation which will arise within a few years if we allow intercontinental ballistic missiles to go into mass production on both sides. The current argument takes place within the context of bomber flights requiring some five hours between the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. We ought to be concerned about the impending technological shift to missiles which will take only 30 minutes. This will completely transform the problem and make the inspection approach obsolete.

Missiles Cannot Be Turned Back

Let us spell out what the shift will mean. A bomber which needs 5 hours for the trip allows two and a half hours for consultation and decision before it is half way to the other side. A missile will be halfway in 15 minutes. A bomber can be recalled. A missile cannot. False "blips" on a radar screen are no problem in the bomber age; they provide the occasion for a training flight from which the planes can easily be recalled as the error becomes obvious. False "blips" may be fatal in the missile age.

Our Distant Early Warning Line on the Arctic rim is roughly halfway between U. S. and U. S. S. R. Fifteen minutes have already elapsed by the time it "sights" an oncoming missile. Only a few minutes remain in which to determine whether the radar screen is registering missiles or electronic ghosts. There is, then, no time to consult the President, even if he is in his office and not on some golf links in Georgia. Indeed the anti-missile missile will depend entirely on an intricate electronic network of devices activated by the radar screen into automatic computation and firing. What if this is set off by a "blip," as SAC flights have been?

Now let us turn to the question of inspection in the missile age. Airdromes can be spotted from the air. Missile bases can be hidden. Indeed missiles will soon be mounted on movable platforms and shifted from place to place. Aerial inspection will not meet the missile problem. Neither will on-the-ground inspection. In the age of the 5-hour bombing plane, reports from inspectors at airdromes several times a day might be enough to reassure both sides, though what is to stop a training flight aloft from shifting to a real attack? But inspectors at missile bases . . . ? If the enemy played fair and let them telegraph news of an impending strike, that would only add 15 minutes to the DEW line warning. But what if they seized the inspectors? How would we know, or the other side know, whether the omission of an every-half-hour "all's well" was due to a breakdown in communications or signalled an impending attack? How decide in those few fateful minutes whether to wait or press the buttons for mutual suicide?

Not Too Far Apart on Inspection

This is the nightmare that lies ahead, and it is this prospect which gives an unreal air to the UN debate over Arctic inspection. A close reading of the Security Council debates of April 21 and April 29 show that the two sides are not as far apart as the headlines seem to indicate. In the debate of April 21, the Soviet representative claimed that it was his country which on May 10, 1955, took the initiative in proposing inspection against surprise attack. This was the proposal for establishing mutual ground inspectors at ports, railway junctions, main motor highways and airdromes to report any tell-tale signs of mobilization. The Soviet resolution of April 29, in asking for discussion at the summit instead of the UN, referred to "the question of drawing up measures to preclude the danger of surprise attack." Mr. Lodge quoted Eisenhower's letter to Bulganin of Oct. 11, 1955, offering to include the Soviet ground inspection proposal with our "open skies" or any variant of it. The real difference on this issue is that the Soviets want to use it as the bargaining point in a package proposal of their own at the summit, perhaps swopping inspection for liquidation of foreign bases, while the U. S. now turns up for separating this one item from the rest of disarmament. Surely the two sides should be magnanimous enough to bridge this space between them. But where attention ought to be focussed is not so much on an inspection which will soon be obsolete, but on negotiations *now* for an international anti-missile agreement to keep the new monsters from going into mass production and raising the curtain on a new nightmare. It will soon be too late.

Imagine the Situation Reversed

We ought to press our own government to contribute toward this by a different attitude at the UN. Mr. Lodge's conduct is coarse and overbearing. The Soviet complaint on April 21 was given "the bum's rush" treatment by our prefabricated majority without adequate discussion. If the roles were reversed, would we be content to be told by Moscow that Soviet bombers on "alarm" flights toward us were practically fool-proof, and could not go on to drop their load unless Krushchev *himself* gave the word? Imagine the uproar in this country if we were on the receiving end.

And should not some Congressional committee find out why the Pentagon cleared that provocative story about the SAC flights just when it was certain to poison the atmosphere of pre-summit talks?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Was All That Clean Bomb Talk Just Hoax and Smoke-Screen?

A series of disclosures indicates that the government's talk of a clean bomb has been most deceptive.

1. On *Meet the Press* (April 27) Anderson of New Mexico, the senior Senator on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, charged that this summer "the number of clean bomb tests will be relatively small" and that "the military is steadily stockpiling dirtier bombs." (See excerpts box below). Senator Anderson has access to much classified information. If what he says is true then talk of developing clean bombs has been a smoke-screen for developing dirtier ones than ever.

2. Even the so-called clean bombs are terribly dirty. In Asilomar, California, April 19, just before addressing the World Affairs Council of Northern California, AEC Commissioner W. F. Libby admitted to reporters that the so-called clean bomb to be fired in the Pacific next summer, though "about 96 percent clean," will actually put twice as much radioactive "dirt" into the atmosphere as the "100 percent dirty bomb" exploded over Hiroshima. (This crucial admission, covered by the *Washington Star* April 20 did not appear in the *New York Times* but when two other speakers at the same conference next day defended AEC policy it appeared in that paper, "Radiation Damage to Genes Doubted.")

Radioactivity from Neutrons

3. Even if, in Dr. Libby's terms, we achieved a bomb which was 100 percent instead of only 96 percent "clean," it would still have a serious residue of radioactivity. The Libby computations are based on the reduction in the ratio of the fissionable material to the fusion it triggers in the big H-bombs. But it appears from expert testimony taken by the Humphrey disarmament subcommittee that even a 100 percent fusion bomb would produce radioactivity in the shape of neutrons. This new revelation came the afternoon of April 17 when it heard two witnesses, Dr. Edward Teller and Prof. Jay Orear, on the opposite sides of two questions—the possibility of policing a test agreement and the possibility of a clean bomb. Unfortunately when Dr. Teller finished testifying the press marched out almost in a body, and Prof. Orear's testimony appeared in few papers; the *New York Times* was among those which did not think it fit to print.

Dr. Teller had testified, "We must have the clean bomb to save the innocent bystander." Senator Humphrey asked Prof. Orear, a physicist, whether he and his colleagues of the Columbia University Inspection for Disarmament Project thought a clean bomb possible. Dr. Orear replied that he doubted the possibility of building an H-bomb without any fissionable material to trigger it. "But even if it could be done," he added, "the fusion process gives you neutrons. These neutrons very quickly are absorbed by nuclei and this makes the nuclei, most of them, radioactive, as you do have radioactivity from the neutrons, and there is no way of getting rid of the neutrons." So the 100 percent "clean" bomb, in the sense that it was clean of all fissionable material, would still be radioactively "dirty." Prof. Orear said he would "roughly estimate that a 100 percent fusion bomb is the equivalent to a 100 percent fission bomb, completely dirty bomb, which is one hundredth as large. In other words a ten megaton completely clean bomb is just as dirty as a 100 kiloton completely dirty bomb."

A New Menace Worse Than Sr 90

4. The radioactive danger has largely been discussed in terms of Strontium 90. But at a press conference here last Monday (April 28) after an Academy of Sciences meeting, Dr. Linus Pauling called attention to a new danger in nuclear fallout—that of the long lived radioactive atom known as carbon 14 which has a half life of 5,000 years. Dr. Pauling said he was shocked to learn from some new fallout figures disclosed by Dr. Libby that every megaton of nuclear explosion produces 17 pounds of radioactive carbon for every one or two pounds of strontium. He said the danger to the human race if it survives over the next 5,000 to 10,000 years would be 200 times as great from radioactive carbon as from radioactive strontium, saying that the former could cause muscle and skin as well as bone cancer and also affect genetic cells. Perhaps the most important point Dr. Pauling stressed is that Carbon 14 is generated by fusion as well as fission, i.e. by "clean" as well as "dirty" bombs.

On March 12 Brig. Gen. Alfred D. Starbird, director of military application for the AEC, told the Humphrey subcommittee in executive session, "I should emphasize that as of now we see no way of making a weapon completely clean." Apparently this was a gross understatement. The clean bomb talk seems to have perpetrated a fraud on the American public.

Senate's No. 1 Atomic Authority Says Military Want Dirtier Bombs

Senator Clinton P. Anderson: "I do not agree that it would be dangerous to stop testing before we achieved them [clean bombs]. I think we know now far more than the Russians do about clean bombs and I think if the Atomic Energy Commission really believed the story about clean bombs they would have some clean bomb tests and a series of tests. I think the number of clean bomb tests will be relatively small in proportion to the number of testings. . . . I believe our State Department does want cleaner bombs, but I believe the military is steadily stockpiling dirtier bombs and I think any investigation would show that. They are not only supporting them, but they have pulled bombs out of the stockpile and inserted something which makes it dirtier. . . . We talk clean on one side, and we stockpile dirty on the other side.

Mr. White: Why do our military want dirty bombs?

Sen. Anderson: They want it effective. You don't have bombs in order to have Fourth of July explosions. You have them for destruction.

Mr. White: Is the clean bomb not going to be effective?

Sen. Anderson: I don't know what it is going to do. It would be all right if you are going to have very limited warfare and if you can be sure you can just pinpoint a target, but if atomic war starts, in the opinion of men like Curt LeMay for example, who plays his war game before the Joint Committee, and I think makes a wonderful case for it, he points out a war is going to be destructive and if you are going to be engaged in destructive war, you better have the instruments of destruction. . . .

—Meet the Press, April 27.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The SCEF: A Handful of Brave People Spark A New Emancipation

Report on the Negro's Slow Uphill Battle for the Vote in the South

The bravest, most isolated group of individuals in this country met here in Washington last week-end. They are the handful of white and Negro Southerners who run the Southern Conference Educational Fund. They held a Conference on Voting Restrictions in the Southern States and their one public session drew a mixed audience of 800 to a local church on a cold rainy Sunday afternoon.

The keynote speaker was Aubrey Williams, of Montgomery, Alabama, publisher of *Southern Farm and Home,* once FDR's National Youth Administrator, a human Gibraltar among the intimidated "good" people of the South. Like James Dombrowski, the devoted executive director of the Southern Conference, Williams is one of the few whites in the South who still speaks up against segregation.

Williams admitted in his speech that race relations had so changed for the worse since the Supreme Court's school decision that there are "few channels of communication" still open between the races. But, unlike most others, he found "something healthy" in this picture. He said the harmonious race relations of the past were more appearance than reality, "a degraded peace" purchased by the Negro "at the price of his self-respect," a price the Negro was no longer willing to pay.

Worst of the Southern States

The reports to the conference showed that while the situation for Negro voters in the South was everywhere bad, it was worst in Mississippi, Alabama and Georgia. In Mississippi, Negroes vote freely in only six of the 82 counties. In Alabama, Negroes represent a third of the total population but only 6 percent of the registered voters. In Georgia, with a million Negroes, only 160,000 are registered, mostly in urban areas.

The Rev. Ben F. Wyland, executive secretary of the Florida Council for Racial Cooperation, reported that five counties in Northern Florida were as bad as the deep South. "There are 16,533 Negroes old enough to vote in those counties," he told the Conference, "only 110 have been able to register." But in Jacksonville, where half the eligible Negroes are registered, a Negro attorney was elected Justice of the Peace two years ago only to have his election declared illegal.

Dr. Wyland was one of three white delegates who reported from their home States. The other two were Miss Willson Whitman, the writer, from North Carolina, and Kenneth Walker, publisher of the *Colfax, La., Chronicle,* which successfully fought a wholesale purge of Negro voters. Walker summed up the situation in Louisiana by saying that the Long faction favored, the anti-Longs opposed, Negro voting.

The best known of the Negro delegates to the conference was the redoubtable Mrs. Modjeska M. Simkins of South Carolina, who has been waging a fight for equality there for 20 years. She reported there were now no blatant restrictions on registration, except in one county, Williamsburg. There a Howard University graduate and the entire faculty of a Negro school were turned down on a literacy test.

Mrs. Simkins had the most optimistic report. She complained of "lethargy and disinterest" on the part of Negroes themselves. Austin T. Walden of Georgia, another old-timer in the civil rights struggle, also spoke of "indifference and timidity on the part of too large a segment of the Negro people in Georgia. . . . Our biggest job is one of education among our own people."

The Quiet Terror in the South

On the other hand the Negro militant faces a difficult time. Voting registrars have an almost endless repertoire of delaying actions. It took E. D. Nixon, the Montgomery pullman porter whose bravery has made him a legend, eight years to register. Registration often costs Negroes heavily in economic reprisals. The conference heard tragic stories of farms and livelihood lost. This new struggle for emancipation has its unknown heroes and obscure martyrs.

Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., of Howard University, summed up "the gauntlet of apathy, ignorance, fear, bodily harm and racial discrimination" the Negro voter must run. Much depends on how effectively the slow starting Civil Rights Commission does its work. But in the longer perspective even these astringent reports showed that the Negro was winning, however slowly. His victory will give the South new vitality and national politics a more progressive orientation.

To Help Free the South

Those who would like to help, and keep in closer touch with, the fight against racism in the South can do so by writing the Southern Conference Educational Fund at 822 Perdido Street, New Orleans. Its excellent monthly, the Southern Patriot, is sent to all contributors free.

A Warning Parallel and the Broader Meaning of the Negro's Struggle

"There are disturbing parallels between conditions in the South in the year of 1958 and in the year of 1858. I sincerely believe that the devastation and the horrors of the Civil War could have been avoided if we had been willing to deal openly with slavery. . . . But we were not. There was almost a complete blackout of discussion by legislatures as well as by social and economic pressures put upon people. School teachers were silenced or sent back to New England, where they came from. . . .

"Today a blanket of silence lies over the whole South. Men no longer discuss the race question in the white community except to view with alarm and deplore; they fear even to talk about a different point of view. . . .

"However, with our preoccupation with the treatment of the Negro, we may tend to overlook the greater significance of the struggle. . . . The issue of the political emancipation of the Negro could be the activating agent that threatens to explode the present ill-mated political setup. . . . The right wing of the Republican party and the Southern oligarchy have everything in common except the names by which they are called. . . . We must recognize the Negro's struggle for what it is—the spearhead which is challenging the hypocrisy of American political party alignment and which, if it succeeds, can clear the ground of the creeping fascism. . . ."

—Aubrey Williams, Washington, April 27.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If An Einstein Medal for Teller, Why Not A Jefferson Award for Eastland?

The Harsh and Unworthy Fictions No One Mentions in the Heikkila Case

By any common sense definition, William Heikkila is an American, not a Finn. His parents were American citizens. Though born to them in Finland, he left there when he was two and a half months old. He had never been back until his "kidnapping" and deportation by the U. S. Immigration authorities at the age of 52. He has lived all but two and a half months of his life in America. For most of his life he thought he was an American citizen. What kind of legal fiction makes him a Finn?

As a legal resident of the United States, Heikkila was subject to the law. If he did anything wrong, he could have been imprisoned. The truth is that the activities for which he is being deported were activities for which he could not be legally punished. He was a member of the Communist party from 1928 to 1939, but that was not illegal. He was also a member of certain organizations on the Attorney General's list, but that was not illegal, either.

One of the Cruelest Punishments

The most pernicious of the legal fictions in this case is that deportation—another word for exile—is only a civil not a criminal procedure. Heikkila can be torn from his American wife, his livelihood, his lifelong associations, and his country, on charges for which he could not be sent to jail for ten days. One of the cruelest of punishments can be imposed for acts protected by the Constitution.

It is a recognition of these harsh fictions, unworthy of a free country, which I find missing in newspaper comment on the Heikkila case. If our vindictive Immigration Service had been a little more decorous and waited a few days for a final order, few would have protested. The big blank in the press matches the big blank in our numbed national conscience. We take the hounding of "aliens" for granted, no matter if they have lived here all their lives, and no matter if they are being deported only for having acted as if this were really a free country. The whole idea of denaturalizing and deporting people for their political activities is an ugly fungus growth on a free society, and this is the point of the Heikkila case, not—as so many newspapers say—the need for making deportation easier.

Explanation and Apology

There was no issue of the Weekly last week because my wife and I ran into terrible weather conditions flying up to Boston for the birth of our first grandchild and were unable to get back in time to get the issue out. Everybody's subscription will be lengthened by a week to make up for this regrettable lapse.

P. S. It was a boy, John Richard Gilbert.—IFS.

THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE, which opposed the Jenner bill on the Supreme Court, also attacked that provision of the Butler substitute which would restrict the Court's right to hear Congressional committee contempt cases. In an editorial (April 25) the Tribune said that to allow committees to decide what questions were "pertinent" was to make them "judges of their own cause" and warned "those who think that the only persons who may be victimized by this arrangement are Communists" that in a future Congress "with a radical majority" conservative citizens "could expect to be bounced around. . . ."

NOW THAT DR. EDWARD TELLER has been given an Einstein medal by Lewis Strauss we expect any day now to hear that a new Thomas Jefferson award has been conferred on Senator Eastland by Cardinal Spellman. . . . One award that will give pleasure to the man it is intended to honor is the conferring of the first Alexander Meiklejohn award for academic freedom by the American Association of University Professors to the University of New Hampshire for permitting Paul M. Sweezy, co-editor of *Monthly Review*, to address its students while free on bail for a First Amendment contempt conviction. . . . We also note with pleasure that the Appellate Division of the New York State Supreme Court has unanimously upheld the State Education Commissioner's ruling that teachers do not need to inform on others to prove their loyalty. . . . Maybe the New York City Board of Education, which is fighting this ruling, should establish an annual Judas Iscariot award for the most "cooperative" school-teacher. . . .

Send A Stamped Self-Addressed Envelope for A Free Copy of the 1957 Index

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

5/5/58

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in th U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED